arXiv:1210.6109v1 [math.PR] 23 Oct 2012

# Stochastic dynamics of determinantal processes by integration by parts

Nicolas Privault* Giovanni Luca Torrisi†

October 24, 2012

**Abstract**

We construct the interacting diffusion processes associated to determinantal point processes on spaces of configurations. This construction is based on the notions of Dirichlet form and integration by parts for functionals of determinantal processes.

*Keywords*: Dirichlet forms; infinite dimensional diffusion processes; closability; integration by parts; Malliavin calculus; determinantal point processes.

*Mathematics Subject Classification*: 60G55, 60H07.

## 1 Introduction

Determinantal processes are point processes that exhibit a repulsion property, and were introduced to represent the configuration of fermions, cf. [10], [16] and [19]. They are known to be connected with the zeros of analytic functions, cf. [8] and references therein.

Our goal in this paper is to construct Dirichlet forms related to determinantal processes, and to apply them to derive the existence of the associated interacting diffusion processes. Those results can be applied to derive formulas for density estimation and sensitivity analysis for functionals of determinantal processes, along the lines in [12].

For this we provide an integration by parts formula for functionals of determinantal processes which is based on a quasi-invariance result discussed in [3] (see also [13]). This integration by parts formula is extended to closed gradient and divergence operators thanks to the use

---

*Division of Mathematical Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, SPMS-MAS-05-43, 21 Nanyang Link Singapore 637371. e-mail: `nprivault@ntu.edu.sg`

†Istituto per le Applicazioni del Calcolo "Mauro Picone", CNR, Via dei Taurini 19, 00185 Roma, Italy. e-mail: `torrisi@iac.rm.cnr.it`

of a set of test functionals different from the one considered in [3] (see also [13]), cf. (3.1) and Theorem 3.2-(*i*) and (*ii*).

In Theorem 4.1 we construct the symmetric Dirichlet form associated to a determinantal process. An application to the associated stochastic dynamics follows in Theorem 5.1, in which we prove the existence of the diffusion process associated to a determinantal process satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 3.2.

We proceed as follows. In Section 2 we recall the definition of point process and of determinantal process, based on [4], [5], [11] and [20] for point processes, and on [8] for determinantal processes. We also refer to [2], [6] and [17] for the required background on functional analysis. In Section 3 we provide an integration by parts formula for functionals of determinantal processes and extend it by a closability argument. In Section 4 we consider the associated Dirichlet form, with application to the associated stochastic dynamics in Section 5.

# 2 Preliminaries

**Locally finite point processes**

Let $(S, d_S)$ be a locally compact Polish space. For any subset $B \subseteq S$, let $\sharp B$ denote the cardinality of $B$, setting $\sharp B = \infty$ if $B$ is not finite. We denote by $\mathrm{N}_{lf}$ the set of locally finite point configurations on $S$:

$$\mathrm{N}_{lf} := \{B \subseteq S\colon\ \sharp(B \cap D) < \infty, \text{ for any compact } D \subseteq S\},$$

equipped with the $\sigma$-field

$$\mathcal{N}_{lf} := \sigma(\{B \in \mathrm{N}_{lf} \ : \ \sharp(B \cap D) = m\},\ m \geq 0,\ D \subseteq S \text{ compact}).$$

Let $\mathbf{X}$ be a locally finite point process on $S$, i.e. a measurable mapping defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ and taking values on $(\mathrm{N}_{lf}, \mathcal{N}_{lf})$. We assume that $\mathbf{X}$ is *simple*, i.e. $N(\{x\}) \in \{0, 1\}$ almost surely (a.s.), for all $x \in S$, where $N(B)$ denotes the number of points of $\mathbf{X}$ on $B \subseteq S$.

The correlation functions of $\mathbf{X}$, with respect to (*w.r.t.*) a Radon measure $\mu$ on $S$, are (if they exist) measurable functions $\rho_k : S^k \longrightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that

$$\mathrm{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{k} N(B_i)\right] = \int_{B_1 \times \ldots \times B_k} \rho_k(x_1, \ldots, x_k)\, \mu(\mathrm{d}x_1) \ldots \mu(\mathrm{d}x_k).$$

for any family of mutually disjoint subsets $B_1, \ldots, B_k$ of $S$, $k \geq 1$. We require in addition that $\rho_k(x_1, \ldots, x_k) = 0$ whenever $x_i = x_j$ for some $1 \leq i \neq j \leq k$.

**Kernels and integral operators**

For any compact set $D \subseteq S$, we denote by $L^2(D, \mu)$ the Hilbert space of complex-valued square integrable functions *w.r.t.* the restriction of the Radon measure $\mu$ on $D$, equipped with the inner product

$$< f, g >_{L^2(D,\mu)} := \int_D f(x)\overline{g(x)}\, \mu(\mathrm{d}x), \quad f, g \in L^2(D, \mu)$$

where $\overline{z}$ denotes the complex conjugate of $z \in \mathbb{C}$. By definition, a kernel $K$ is a measurable function from $S^2$ to $\mathbb{C}$. We say that $K$ is locally square integrable if, for any compact $D \subseteq S$, we have

$$\int_{D^2} |K(x, y)|^2 \mu(\mathrm{d}x)\mu(\mathrm{d}y) < \infty. \tag{2.1}$$

To any locally square integrable kernel $K$, we associate the integral operators $\mathcal{K}_D : L^2(D, \mu) \longrightarrow L^2(D, \mu)$, where $D$ is a compact subset of $S$, defined by

$$\mathcal{K}_D f(x) := \int_D K(x, y) f(y)\, \mu(\mathrm{d}y), \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-almost all } x \in D.$$

A straightforward application of the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality shows that the operator $\mathcal{K}_D$ is bounded when the kernel $K$ is locally square integrable. In fact, it can be shown that $\mathcal{K}_D$ is a compact operator.

To any locally square integrable kernel $K$, we associate the integral operator $\mathcal{K}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{K} f(x) := \int_S K(x, y) f(y)\, \mu(\mathrm{d}y), \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-almost all } x \in S$$

for functions $f \in L^2(S, \mu)$ that vanish outside a compact subset of $S$. The operator $\mathcal{K}$ is said Hermitian or self-adjoint if

$$K(x, y) = \overline{K(y, x)}, \quad \text{for } \mu^{\otimes 2}\text{-almost all } (x, y) \in S^2. \tag{2.2}$$

Equivalently, this means that the integral operators $\mathcal{K}_D$ are self-adjoint for any compact $D \subseteq S$. If $\mathcal{K}_D$ is self-adjoint, by the spectral theorem for self-adjoint and compact operators we have that $L^2(D,\mu)$ has an orthonormal basis $\{\varphi_j^D\}_{j\geq 1}$ of eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{K}_D$. The corresponding eigenvalues $\{\lambda_j^D\}_{j\geq 1}$ have finite multiplicity (except possibly the zero eigenvalue) and the only possible accumulation point of the eigenvalues is the zero eigenvalue.

We say that a self-adjoint integral operator $\mathcal{K}_D$ is of trace class if

$$\sum_{j\geq 1} |\lambda_j^D| < \infty.$$

If $\mathcal{K}_D$ is of trace class for every compact subset $D \subseteq S$, then we say that $\mathcal{K}$ is locally of trace class.

**Determinantal point processes on** $(S, d_S)$

Throughout this paper we shall work under the following hypothesis:
**(H1)**: *The kernel* $K : S^2 \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ *is locally square integrable, satisfies* (2.2) *and is non-negative definite, i.e.*

$$\det(K(x_i,x_j))_{1\leq i,j\leq k} \geq 0, \qquad \mu^{\otimes k}(dx_1,\dots,dx_k) - a.e., \quad k \geq 1.$$

*The operator* $\mathcal{K}$ *is locally of trace class and its spectrum is contained in* $[0,1)$.

Suppose that $K$ and $\mathcal{K}$ satisfy (**H1**). A locally finite and simple point process $\mathbf{X} \equiv \{X_n\}_{1\leq n\leq N(S)}$ on $S$ is called a determinantal process if its correlation functions *w.r.t.* the Radon measure $\mu$ on $S$ satisfy

$$\rho_k(x_1,\dots,x_k) = \det(K(x_i,x_j))_{1\leq i,j\leq k},$$

for any $k \geq 1$ and $x_1,\dots,x_k \in S$.

Existence and uniqueness (in law) of determinantal processes is guaranteed by the results in [10], [16] and [18]. See also Lemma 4.2.6 and Theorem 4.5.5 in [8]. More precisely, if a kernel $K$ and its associated integral operator $\mathcal{K}$ satisfy (**H1**), then there exists a determinantal process $\mathbf{X}$ on $S$ with kernel $K$. Moreover, for any compact $D \subseteq S$ there exist constants $c_1(D), c_2(D) > 0$ such that $P(N(D) > k) \leq c_1(D)\mathrm{e}^{-c_2(D)k}$ for all $k \geq 1$, and in this case the correlation functions $\rho_k(x_1,\dots,x_k)$ uniquely determine the law of the process.

# 3 Differential calculus and integration by parts

Hereafter we assume that $S$ is a domain of $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d_S$ is the Euclidean distance, $\mu$ is a Radon measure on $S$ and $D \subset S$ is a fixed compact. We denote by $\| \cdot \|$ the Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and by $x^{(i)}$ the $i$-th component of $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

### Differential calculus

We denote by $\mathcal{C}_c^\infty(D, \mathbb{R}^d)$ the set of all $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-vector fields $v : D \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ with compact support. Let $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty(D^k)$ be the set of all $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-functions on $D^k$ whose derivatives are bounded, and let

$$\mathbf{X}^D = \mathbf{X} \cap D = \{X_1, \ldots, X_{N(D)}\}$$

denote the restriction to $D$ of the determinantal process $\mathbf{X} \equiv \{X_n\}_{1 \le n \le N(S)}$, assumed it exists.

**Definition 1** *A random variable (r.v.) $F(\mathbf{X}^D)$ is said to be in $\mathcal{S}_D$ if*

$$F(\mathbf{X}^D) = f_0 \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=0\}} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}} f_k(X_1, \ldots, X_k), \tag{3.1}$$

*where, for some integer $n \ge 1$ and $k = 1, \ldots, n$, $f_k \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(D^k)$ is a symmetric function and $f_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ is a constant.*

The gradient of $F(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \mathcal{S}_D$ as in (3.1) is defined by

$$\nabla_x^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} F(\mathbf{X}^D) := \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathbf{1}_{\{X_i\}}(x) \nabla_{x_i} f_k(X_1, \ldots, X_k), \qquad x \in D, \tag{3.2}$$

where $\nabla_{x_i}$ denotes the usual gradient on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with respect to variable $x_i$. For $v \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(D, \mathbb{R}^d)$, we also let

$$\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} F(\mathbf{X}^D) := \sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \nabla_{X_k}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} F(\mathbf{X}^D) \cdot v(X_k) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \nabla_{x_i} f_k(X_1, \ldots, X_k) \cdot v(X_i), \tag{3.3}$$

where $\cdot$ denotes the inner product on $\mathbb{R}^d$.

### Integration by parts and closability

In this section and Theorem 3.2 below we give an integration by parts formula for determinantal processes, based on closed gradient and divergence operators $\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}$ and $\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}*}$ defined below for $v \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(D, \mathbb{R}^d)$. The proof of Theorem 3.2 relies on an integration by parts formula on the set of test functionals $\mathcal{S}_D$ introduced in (3.1), extending and making more precise the arguments of Theorem 10 page 289 of [3] and its proof. See also Theorem 5.5 and Proposition 5.6 in [13] for more details.

Let $K$ be a kernel satisfying assumption (**H1**). We define the trace class integral operator on $L^2(D, \mu)$

$$\mathcal{J}[D] := (\mathbf{Id} - \mathcal{K}_D)^{-1}\mathcal{K}_D$$

and denote by $J[D]$ its kernel. Let $\mathrm{N}_f^D$ be the space of finite configurations on $D$. For $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \in \mathrm{N}_f^D$, we denote by $\det J[D](\mathbf{x}) = \det J[D](\{x_1, \dots, x_n\})$ the determinant $\det\left(J[D](x_i, x_j)\right)_{1 \le i,j \le n}$. Note that the function

$$(x_1, \dots, x_n) \mapsto \det J[D](\{x_1, \dots, x_n\})$$

is $\mu^{\otimes n}$-a.e. non-negative and symmetric in $x_1, \dots, x_n$ (see e.g. [7]), and we simply write $\det J[D](\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}) = \det J[D](x_1, \dots, x_n)$.

(**H2**) : *We suppose that, for any $n \ge 1$, the function*

$$(x_1, \dots, x_n) \longmapsto \det J[D](x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

*is strictly positive $\mu^{\otimes n}$-a.e. on $D^n$ and continuously differentiable on the whole $D^n$.*

Hereafter, we denote by $P_{\mathbf{X}^D}$ the law of $\mathbf{X}^D$ on $\mathrm{N}_f^D$. Note that if, for any $n \ge 1$, $\det J[D](x_1, \dots, x_n) > 0$ $\mu^{\otimes n}$-a.e. on $D^n$, then

$$\det J[D](\mathbf{x}) > 0, \qquad \text{for } P_{\mathbf{X}^D}\text{-a.a. } \mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{N}_f^D,$$

(this easily follows by using the notion of $\mu$-sample measure and Janossy density, see e.g. [7].) Assuming that (**H1**) and (**H2**) hold, the potential energy is the function $U : \mathrm{N}_f^D \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$U(\mathbf{x}) := -\log\det J[D](\mathbf{x}).$$

We set

$$\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} U(\mathbf{X}^D) \ := \ -\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\nabla_{x_i} \det J[D](X_1, \dots, X_k)}{\det J[D](X_1, \dots, X_k)} \cdot v(X_i)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} U_{i,k}(X_1,\ldots,X_k)\cdot v(X_i), \tag{3.4}$$

for any vector field $v \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(D,\mathbb{R}^d)$.

We shall also assume the following condition.
(**H3**) : *The Radon measure $\mu$ is absolutely continuous* w.r.t. *the Lebesgue measure on $S$, with Radon-Nikodym derivative $\rho$ which is strictly positive and continuously differentiable on $D$.*

Under Conditions (**H1**) and (**H3**) we define the vector field

$$\beta^\mu(x) := \frac{\nabla \rho(x)}{\rho(x)}$$

and the random variable

$$B_v^\mu(\mathbf{X}^D) := \sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} (-\beta^\mu(X_k)\cdot v(X_k) + \operatorname{div} v(X_k)), \qquad v \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(D,\mathbb{R}^d),$$

where div denotes the adjoint of the gradient $\nabla$ on $D$, i.e.

$$\int_D g(x)\,\operatorname{div}\nabla f(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_D \nabla f(x)\cdot\nabla g(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \quad f,g \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(D).$$

We now give an integration by parts formula for determinantal processes which makes more precise some aspects of the proof of Theorem 10 of [3].

**Lemma 3.1** *Assume that* (**H1**), (**H2**) *and* (**H3**) *hold. Then, for any $F(\mathbf{X}^D), G(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \mathcal{S}_D$ and vector field $v \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(S,\mathbb{R}^d)$, we have*

$$\mathrm{E}[G(\mathbf{X}^D)\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} F(\mathbf{X}^D)] = \mathrm{E}[F(\mathbf{X}^D)\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}*} G(\mathbf{X}^D)], \tag{3.5}$$

*where*

$$\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}*} G(\mathbf{X}^D) := -\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} G(\mathbf{X}^D) + G(\mathbf{X}^D)\left(B_v^\mu(\mathbf{X}^D) + \nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} U(\mathbf{X}^D)\right).$$

*Proof.* For any vector field $v \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(D,\mathbb{R}^d)$, consider the flow $\phi_t^v : D \longrightarrow D$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, where for a fixed $x \in D$, the curve $t \mapsto \phi_t^v(x)$ is defined as the solution to the Cauchy problem

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\phi_t^v(x) = v(\phi_t^v(x)), \quad \phi_0^v(x) = x.$$

For a given family of flows $\{\phi_t^v : \ t \in \mathbb{R}, \, v \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(D, \mathbb{R}^d)\}$, we define the mapping $\Phi_t^v : \mathrm{N}_f^D \longrightarrow \mathrm{N}_f^D$ by

$$\Phi_t^v(\mathbf{x}) := \{\phi_t^v(x) : \ x \in \mathbf{x}\}.$$

Following [1], for a functional $R(\mathbf{X}^D)$ of the determinantal process, we define the gradient $\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} R(\mathbf{X}^D)$ as the directional derivative along $v$, i.e.

$$\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} R(\mathbf{X}^D) := \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} R(\Phi_t^v(\mathbf{X}^D))\Big|_{t=0},$$

provided the derivative exists. It is easy to check that formulas (3.3) and (3.4) are consistent with this definition. Note that the image measure $\mu \circ \phi_{-t}^v$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mu$ on $D$, with Radon-Nikodym derivative

$$\frac{\rho(\phi_{-t}^v(x))}{\rho(x)} \, \mathrm{Jac}^{\phi_t^v}(x)$$

where $\mathrm{Jac}^{\phi_t^v}$ denotes the Jacobian of $\phi_t^v$. Note also that

$$\mathrm{Jac}^{\phi_t^v}(x) = \exp\left(\int_0^t \operatorname{div} v(\phi_z^v(x)) \, \mathrm{d}z\right) \tag{3.6}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(\frac{\rho(\phi_{-t}^v(x))}{\rho(x)} \, \mathrm{Jac}^{\phi_t^v}(x)\right) = & - \frac{\nabla \rho(\phi_{-t}^v(x))}{\rho(x)} \cdot v(\phi_{-t}^v(x)) \\ & + \frac{\rho(\phi_{-t}^v(x))}{\rho(x)} \exp\left(\int_0^t \operatorname{div} v(\phi_z^v(x)) \, \mathrm{d}z\right) \operatorname{div} v(\phi_t^v(x)) \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

(see e.g. the proof of Lemma 5.3 in [13]). Using the quasi-invariance property of determinantal processes discussed in Theorem 8 of [3] (see also Theorems 3.2 and 4.1 in [13]), for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $F(\mathbf{X}^D), G(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \mathcal{S}_D$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E}[F(\Phi_t^v(\mathbf{X}^D))G(\mathbf{X}^D)] \\ & = \mathrm{E}\left[F(\mathbf{X}^D)G(\Phi_{-t}^v(\mathbf{X}^D))\left(\prod_{k=1}^{N(D)} \frac{\rho(\phi_{-t}^v(X_k))}{\rho(X_k)} \, \mathrm{Jac}^{\phi_t^v}(X_k)\right) \frac{\det J[D](\phi_{-t}^v(X_1), \ldots, \phi_{-t}^v(X_{N(D)}))}{\det J[D](X_1, \ldots, X_{N(D)})}\right] \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

We start by exchanging the derivative $\mathrm{d}/\mathrm{d}t$ with the expectation sign E in the above relation, for all $t \in I_0$ a neighborhood of zero. This interchange will be justified by integrability after (3.9) below. In this case we have

$$\mathrm{E}\left[G(\mathbf{X}^D) \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} F(\Phi_t^v(\mathbf{X}^D))\right]$$

$$
= \mathrm{E}\left[\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}G(\Phi^v_{-t}(\mathbf{X}^D))\right)F(\mathbf{X}^D)\left(\prod_{k=1}^{N(D)}\frac{\rho(\phi^v_{-t}(X_k))}{\rho(X_k)}\,\mathrm{Jac}^{\phi^v_t}(X_k)\right)\frac{\det J[D](\phi^v_{-t}(X_1),\ldots,\phi^v_{-t}(X_{N(D)}))}{\det J[D](X_1,\ldots,X_{N(D)})}\right]
$$

$$
+\,\mathrm{E}\left[\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\prod_{k=1}^{N(D)}\frac{\rho(\phi^v_{-t}(X_k))}{\rho(X_k)}\,\mathrm{Jac}^{\phi^v_t}(X_k)\right)F(\mathbf{X}^D)G(\Phi^v_{-t}(\mathbf{X}^D))\frac{\det J[D](\phi^v_{-t}(X_1),\ldots,\phi^v_{-t}(X_{N(D)}))}{\det J[D](X_1,\ldots,X_{N(D)})}\right]
$$

$$
+\,\mathrm{E}\left[\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\frac{\det J[D](\phi^v_{-t}(X_1),\ldots,\phi^v_{-t}(X_{N(D)}))}{\det J[D](X_1,\ldots,X_{N(D)})}\right)F(\mathbf{X}^D)G(\Phi^v_{-t}(\mathbf{X}^D))\prod_{k=1}^{N(D)}\frac{\rho(\phi^v_{-t}(X_k))}{\rho(X_k)}\,\mathrm{Jac}^{\phi^v_t}(X_k)\right].
$$

The claimed integration by parts formula follows by evaluating the above relation at $t = 0$. In particular, we use (3.7) to evaluate the second term inside the expectation in the right-hand side of the above equality, and we use the relation

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\frac{\det J[D](\phi^v_{-t}(X_1),\ldots,\phi^v_{-t}(X_{N(D)}))}{\det J[D](X_1,\ldots,X_{N(D)})}
= -\sum_{i=1}^{N(D)}\frac{\nabla_{x_i}\det J[D](\phi^v_{-t}(X_1),\ldots,\phi^v_{-t}(X_{N(D)}))}{\det J[D](X_1,\ldots,X_{N(D)})}\cdot v(\phi^v_{-t}(X_i)) \tag{3.9}
$$

to evaluate the third term inside the expectation in the right-hand side of the above equality. Using the definition of functionals in $\mathcal{S}_D$, one checks that the r.v.

$$
G(\mathbf{X}^D)\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}F(\Phi^v_t(\mathbf{X}^D))
$$

is uniformly bounded in $t \in I_0$ by a positive constant. By the assumptions (**H2**) and (**H3**) and the form (3.1) of the functionals in $\mathcal{S}_D$, one may easily check that all the terms inside the expectations in the right-hand side of the above equality can be uniformly bounded in $t \in I_0$ by integrable r.v.'s and this justifies the exchange of expectation and derivative in (3.8). We check this fact only for the latter term. Take

$$
F(\mathbf{X}^D) = f_0\mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=0\}} + \sum_{k=1}^{n}\mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}}f_k(X_1,\ldots,X_k)
$$

of the form (3.1). By (3.9) we easily see that the modulus of the r.v.

$$
\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\frac{\det J[D](\phi^v_{-t}(X_1),\ldots,\phi^v_{-t}(X_{N(D)}))}{\det J[D](X_1,\ldots,X_{N(D)})}\right)F(\mathbf{X}^D)G(\Phi^v_{-t}(\mathbf{X}^D))\prod_{k=1}^{N(D)}\frac{\rho(\phi^v_{-t}(X_k))}{\rho(X_k)}\,\mathrm{Jac}^{\phi^v_t}(X_k)
$$

up to a positive constant is bounded above by

$$
\sum_{k=1}^{n}\mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{k}\frac{\rho(\phi^v_{-t}(X_i))}{\rho(X_i)}\,\mathrm{Jac}^{\phi^v_t}(X_i)\right)\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left|\frac{\nabla_{x_i}\det J[D](\phi^v_{-t}(X_1),\ldots,\phi^v_{-t}(X_k))}{\det J[D](X_1,\ldots,X_k)}\cdot v(\phi^v_{-t}(X_i))\right| \tag{3.10}
$$

Since $\rho$ is continuous on $D$, for any $n \geq 1$, the map

$$(x_1,\dots,x_n) \longmapsto \det J[D](x_1,\dots,x_n)$$

is continuously differentiable on $D^n$, and the Jacobian is given by (3.6), up to a positive constant, the term in (3.10) is bounded above, uniformly in $t \in I_0$, by

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}} \frac{\rho(X_1)^{-1}\cdots\rho(X_k)^{-1}}{\det J[D](X_1,\dots,X_k)}.$$

To conclude the proof, we only need to check that the mean of this r.v. is finite. Hereafter, we shall denote by $j_D^{(n)}$, $n \geq 0$, the Janossy densities of $\mathbf{X}^D$, i.e. the densities of $(X_1,\dots,X_n)$ *w.r.t.* $\mu^{\otimes n}$ given that $N(D)=n$. It is known, see [16] and also Theorem 2 in [3], that

$$j_D^{(n)}(x_1,\dots,x_n) = \frac{\mathrm{Det}(\mathbf{Id}-\mathcal{K}_D)}{n!P(N(D)=n)}\det J[D](x_1,\dots,x_n), \quad n \geq 1, \tag{3.11}$$

and $j_D^{(0)}(\emptyset) = \mathrm{Det}(\mathbf{Id}-\mathcal{K}_D)/P(N(D)=0)$, where $\mathrm{Det}(\mathbf{Id}-\mathcal{K}_D)$ denotes the Fredholm determinant of $\mathbf{Id}-\mathcal{K}_D$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}\left[\mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}}\frac{\rho(X_1)^{-1}\cdots\rho(X_k)^{-1}}{\det J[D](X_1,\dots,X_k)}\right] &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{\rho(X_1)^{-1}\cdots\rho(X_k)^{-1}}{\det J[D](X_1,\dots,X_k)}\,\Big|\, N(D)=k\right] P(N(D)=k) \\
&= P(N(D)=k)\int_{D^k}\frac{j_D^{(k)}(x_1,\dots,x_k)}{\det J[D](x_1,\dots,x_k)}\,\mathrm{d}x_1\dots\mathrm{d}x_k \\
&= \frac{\mathrm{Det}(\mathbf{Id}-\mathcal{K}_D)}{k!}\,\ell(D^k) < \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\ell$ denotes the Lebesgue measure. $\square$

Next, we extend the integration by parts formula by closability to a larger class of functionals, cf. the Appendix Section 6 for a summary on the notion of closability. We let

$$\mathrm{L}^2_D := \mathrm{L}^2(\Omega,\mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{X}^D},P),$$

where $\mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{X}^D}$ denotes the $\sigma$-field generated by $\mathbf{X}^D$, the determinantal process $\mathbf{X}$ restricted to $D$. In particular, note that $\mathcal{S}_D$ is dense in $\mathrm{L}^2_D$ (see Lemma 6.1).

For $v \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(D,\mathbb{R}^d)$, we consider the closability of the linear operators $\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} : \mathcal{S}_D \longrightarrow \mathrm{L}^2_D$ and $\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}*} : \mathcal{S}_D \longrightarrow \mathrm{L}^2_D$ defined, respectively, by $F(\mathbf{X}^D) \mapsto \nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}F(\mathbf{X}^D)$ and $F(\mathbf{X}^D) \mapsto \nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}*}F(\mathbf{X}^D)$. In addition we state our extension of the integration by parts formula by closability. In the following, we denote by $\overline{A}$ the minimal closed extension of a closable linear operator $A$, and by $\mathrm{Dom}(\overline{A})$ the domain of $\overline{A}$, see the Appendix Section 6 for details.

**Theorem 3.2** *Assume that* (**H1**), (**H2**) *and* (**H3**) *hold, and that*

$$\int_{D^n} \left| \frac{\partial_{x_i^{(h)}} \det J[D](x_1,\ldots,x_n) \partial_{x_j^{(k)}} \det J[D](x_1,\ldots,x_n)}{\det J[D](x_1,\ldots,x_n)} \right| \rho(x_1)\cdots\rho(x_n)\,\mathrm{d}x_1\ldots\mathrm{d}x_n < \infty \tag{3.12}$$

*for any* $n \geq 1$, $1 \leq i,j \leq n$ *and* $1 \leq h,k \leq d$*. Then*

(*i*) *the linear operators* $\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}$ *and* $\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}*}$ *are well-defined and closable for any vector field* $v \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(D,\mathbb{R}^d)$*. In particular, we have*

$$\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}(\mathcal{S}_D) \subset \mathrm{L}_D^2 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}*}(\mathcal{S}_D) \subset \mathrm{L}_D^2.$$

(*ii*) *for any vector field* $v \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(D,\mathbb{R}^d)$*, we have*

$$\mathrm{E}\left[\mathbf{G}\overline{\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}}\mathbf{F}\right] = \mathrm{E}\left[\mathbf{F}\overline{\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}*}}\mathbf{G}\right]$$

*for all* $\mathbf{F} \in \mathrm{Dom}\left(\overline{\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}}\right)$, $\mathbf{G} \in \mathrm{Dom}\left(\overline{\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}*}}\right)$ *in the domains of the closed extensions of* $\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}$ *and* $\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}*}$*.*

Note that under the assumptions (**H1**), (**H2**) and (**H3**), condition (3.12) is satisfied if, for any $n \geq 1$, the function

$$(x_1,\ldots,x_n) \longmapsto \det J[D](x_1,\ldots,x_n),$$

is strictly positive on the compact $D^n$.

*Proof of Theorem 3.2.* (*i*) Let $v \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(D,\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $F(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \mathcal{S}_D$. For ease of notation, throughout this proof we write $\nabla_v$ in place of $\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}$ and $\nabla_v^*$ in place of $\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}*}$. We clearly have

$$|\nabla_v F(\mathbf{X}^D)| \leq C$$

for some constant $C > 0$, almost surely, and therefore $\nabla_v(\mathcal{S}_D) \subset \mathrm{L}_D^2$. The claim $\nabla_v^*(\mathcal{S}_D) \subset \mathrm{L}_D^2$ follows if we check that $\|G(\mathbf{X}^D)\nabla_v U(\mathbf{X}^D)\|_{\mathrm{L}_D^2} < \infty$ and $\|G(\mathbf{X}^D) B_v^\mu(\mathbf{X}^D)\|_{\mathrm{L}_D^2} < \infty$ for any $G(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \mathcal{S}_D$. The latter relation easily follows noticing that

$$|G(\mathbf{X}^D) B_v^\mu(\mathbf{X}^D)| \leq C$$

for some constant $C > 0$, almost surely. Hereafter, we shall denote by $j_D^{(n)}$, $n \geq 0$, the Janossy densities of $\mathbf{X}^D$ (see the proof of Lemma 3.1 for the definition). Taking

$$G(\mathbf{X}^D) = g_0 \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=0\}} + \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}} g_k(X_1,\ldots,X_k)$$

of the form (3.1), by (3.4) we have

$$G(\mathbf{X}^D)\nabla_v U(\mathbf{X}^D) \;=\; -\sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}} g_k(X_1,\ldots,X_k) \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\nabla_{x_i}\det J[D](X_1,\ldots,X_k)}{\det J[D](X_1,\ldots,X_k)} \cdot v(X_i),$$

and for some positive constant $C > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|G(\mathbf{X}^D)\nabla_v U(\mathbf{X}^D)\|^2_{\mathrm{L}^2_D} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^m P(\{N(D)=k\}) \\
&\quad \int_{D^k} g_k^2(x_1,\ldots,x_k)\left(\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\nabla_{x_i}\det J[D](x_1,\ldots,x_k)}{\det J[D](x_1,\ldots,x_k)}\cdot v(x_i)\right)^2 j_D^{(k)}(x_1,\ldots,x_k)\mu(dx_1)\cdots\mu(dx_k) \\
&= \mathrm{Det}(\mathbf{Id}-\mathcal{K}_D)\sum_{k=1}^m \frac{1}{k!} \\
&\quad \int_{D^k} \frac{g_k^2(x_1,\ldots,x_k)}{\det J[D](x_1,\ldots,x_k)}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k \nabla_{x_i}\det J[D](x_1,\ldots,x_k)\cdot v(x_i)\right)^2 \mu(dx_1)\cdots\mu(dx_k) \\
&\le C\,\mathrm{Det}(\mathbf{Id}-\mathcal{K}_D)\sum_{k=1}^m \frac{1}{k!} \\
&\quad \sum_{1\le i,j\le k}\int_{D^k} \frac{\nabla_{x_i}\det J[D](x_1,\ldots,x_k)\cdot v(x_i)\,\nabla_{x_j}\det J[D](x_1,\ldots,x_k)\cdot v(x_j)}{\det J[D](x_1,\ldots,x_k)}\mu(dx_1)\cdots\mu(dx_k) \\
&< \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where the latter integral is finite by assumption (3.12).

To conclude, we only need to show that $\nabla_v$ is closable (the closability of $\nabla_v^*$ can be proved similarly). Let $(F_n(\mathbf{X}^D))_{n\ge1}$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{S}_D$ converging to 0 in $\mathrm{L}^2_D$ and such that $\nabla_v F_n(\mathbf{X}^D)$ converges to $V$ in $\mathrm{L}^2_D$ as $n$ goes to infinity. We need to show that $V=0$ a.s. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathrm{E}[G(\mathbf{X}^D)V]| &= \lim_{n\to\infty}|\mathrm{E}[G(\mathbf{X}^D)\nabla_v F_n(\mathbf{X}^D)]| = \lim_{n\to\infty}|\mathrm{E}[F_n(\mathbf{X}^D)\nabla_v^* G(\mathbf{X}^D)]| \\
&\le \|\nabla_v^* G(\mathbf{X}^D)\|_{\mathrm{L}^2_D}\lim_{n\to\infty}\|F_n(\mathbf{X}^D)\|_{\mathrm{L}^2_D} = 0, \qquad G\in\mathcal{S}_D.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Here, the second inequality in (3.13) follows by the integration by parts formula (3.5) of Lemma 3.1. The fact that $\mathrm{E}[G(\mathbf{X}^D)V]=0$ for all $G(\mathbf{X}^D)\in\mathcal{S}_D$ implies $V=0$ a.s. is a consequence of the density Lemma 6.1 in the Appendix Section 6.

(*ii*) Again, for ease of notation we write $\nabla_v$ in place of $\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}$ and $\nabla_v^*$ in place of $\nabla_v^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}*}$. By (*i*), both operators $\nabla_v$ and $\nabla_v^*$ are closable. Take $\mathbf{F} \in \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\nabla_v})$, $\mathbf{G} \in \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\nabla_v^*})$ and let $(F_n(\mathbf{X}^D))_{n\geq 1}$, $(G_n(\mathbf{X}^D))_{n\geq 1}$ be sequences in $\mathcal{S}_D$ such that $F_n(\mathbf{X}^D)$ converges to $\mathbf{F}$, $G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)$ converges to $\mathbf{G}$, $\nabla_v F_n(\mathbf{X}^D)$ converges to $\overline{\nabla_v}\mathbf{F}$ and $\nabla_v^* G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)$ converges to $\overline{\nabla_v^*}\mathbf{G}$ in $\mathrm{L}_D^2$ as $n$ goes to infinity. By Lemma 3.1 the integration by parts formula applies to r.v.'s in $\mathcal{S}_D$, therefore we have $\mathrm{E}[G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)\nabla_v F_n(\mathbf{X}^D)] = \mathrm{E}[F_n(\mathbf{X}^D)\nabla_v^* G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)]$ for all $n \geq 1$. The claim follows if we prove that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{E}[G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)\nabla_v F_n(\mathbf{X}^D)] = \mathrm{E}[\mathbf{G}\overline{\nabla_v}\mathbf{F}]$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{E}[F_n(\mathbf{X}^D)\nabla_v^* G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)] = \mathrm{E}[\mathbf{F}\overline{\nabla_v^*}\mathbf{G}].$$

We only show the first limit above; the second limit being proved similarly. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathrm{E}[G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)\nabla_v F_n(\mathbf{X}^D)] - \mathrm{E}[\mathbf{G}\overline{\nabla_v}\mathbf{F}]| \\
&= |\mathrm{E}[G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)\nabla_v F_n(\mathbf{X}^D)] - \mathrm{E}[G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)\overline{\nabla_v}\mathbf{F}] + \mathrm{E}[G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)\overline{\nabla_v}\mathbf{F}] - \mathrm{E}[\mathbf{G}\overline{\nabla_v}\mathbf{F}]| \\
&\leq |\mathrm{E}[G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)(\nabla_v F_n(\mathbf{X}^D) - \overline{\nabla_v}\mathbf{F})]| + |\mathrm{E}[(G_n(\mathbf{X}^D) - \mathbf{G})\overline{\nabla_v}\mathbf{F}]| \\
&\leq \|G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)\|_{\mathrm{L}_D^2}\|\nabla_v F_n(\mathbf{X}^D) - \overline{\nabla_v}\mathbf{F}\|_{\mathrm{L}_D^2} + \|G_n(\mathbf{X}^D) - \mathbf{G}\|_{\mathrm{L}_D^2}\|\overline{\nabla_v}\mathbf{F}\|_{\mathrm{L}_D^2},
\end{aligned}$$

which tends to 0 as $n$ goes to infnity. □

We finally give an illustrating example for Theorem 3.2.

## Example

Let $S := B(0,R) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the open ball centered at the origin with radius $R \in (0,1)$, let $\{\varphi_k^{(R)}\}_{1\leq k\leq N}$, $N \geq 1$, denote the orthonormal subset of $L^2(B(0,R),\ell)$ defined by

$$\varphi_k^{(R)}(x) := \frac{1}{R}\sqrt{\frac{k+1}{\pi}}\left(\frac{x^{(1)}}{R} + i\frac{x^{(2)}}{R}\right)^k, \quad x = (x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}) \in B(0,R),$$

where $\mu = \ell$ is the Lebesgue measure and $i := \sqrt{-1}$ denotes the complex unit. We consider the modified Bergman kernel $K : B(0,R)^2 \to \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$K(x,y) := \sum_{k=1}^{N} R^{2(k+1)}\varphi_k^{(R)}(x)\overline{\varphi_k^{(R)}(y)}, \qquad x, y \in B(0,R),$$

and denote by $\mathcal{K}$ the associated integral operator, which is easily seen to be Hermitian and locally of trace class with non-zero eigenvalues $\kappa_k := R^{2(k+1)}$, $k = 1, \ldots, N$. As a consequence, the spectrum of $\mathcal{K}$ is contained in $[0,1)$ and the triplet $(\mathcal{K},K,\mu)$ satisfies assumption (**H1**). In addition, Condition (**H3**) is trivially satisfied since $\mu=\ell$ is the Lebesgue measure.

Taking $D:=\overline{B(0,r)}$ the closure of the ball $B(0,r)$ for some $0<r<R$, we note that the kernel $K_D$ of the restriction of $K$ to $\overline{B(0,r)}$ takes the form

$$K_D(x,y)=\sum_{k=1}^{N} r^{2(k+1)}\varphi_k^{(r)}(x)\overline{\varphi_k^{(r)}(y)},\quad (x,y)\in\overline{B(0,r)}^2.$$

Denoting by $\mathbf{X}$ the determinantal process associated to the triplet $(\mathcal{K},K,\mu)$, the Janossy densities of $\mathbf{X}^D$ defined in (3.11) are given by

$$j_D^{(k)}(x_1,\dots,x_k)=C_k\det(L_D^{(k)}(x_p,x_q))_{1\le p,q\le k},\qquad k=1,\dots,N,\quad (x_1,\dots,x_k)\in D^k,$$

where $C_k$ is a positive normalizing constant, and the kernel $L_D^{(k)}(x,y)$ is given by

$$L_D^{(k)}(x,y):=\sum_{h=1}^{k}\frac{r^{2(h+1)}}{1-r^{2(h+1)}}\varphi_h^{(r)}(x)\overline{\varphi_h^{(r)}(y)},$$

cf. e.g. Exercise 4.5.2 in [8]. Therefore, $\det J[D](x_1,\dots,x_k)$ and $\det(L_D^{(k)}(x_p,x_q))_{1\le p,q\le k}$ coincide up to a positive normalizing constant, $k=1,\dots,N$, and in order to check condition (**H2**) it suffices to to check that the function

$$(x_1,\dots,x_k)\to\det(L_D^{(k)}(x_p,x_q))_{1\le p,q\le k}$$

is continuously differentiable on $D^k$ and strictly positive for Lebesgue-almost all $(x_1,\dots,x_k)\in D^k$. The continuous differentiability is immediate by the definition of $L_D^{(k)}$. Concerning the strict positivity, we note that we have

$$(L_D^{(k)}(x_p,x_q))_{1\le p,q\le k}=AA^*,$$

hence

$$\det(L_D^{(k)}(x_p,x_q))_{1\le p,q\le k}=|\det A|^2,$$

where the matrix $A:=(A_{ph})_{1\le p,h\le k}$ is given by

$$A_{ph}:=\frac{r^{h+1}}{\sqrt{1-r^{2(h+1)}}}\varphi_h^{(r)}(x_p)$$

and $A^*$ denotes the transpose conjugate of $A$. In order to show that $\det A\neq 0$ for almost all $(x_1,\dots,x_k)\in D^k$ it suffices to note that the Vandermonde determinant

$$\det\widetilde{A}=\left(\prod_{p=1}^{k}(x_p^{(1)}+ix_p^{(2)})\right)\prod_{1\le p<q\le k}((x_p^{(1)}-x_q^{(1)})+i(x_p^{(2)}-x_q^{(2)}))$$

of $\widetilde{A} := ((x_p^{(1)} + ix_p^{(2)})^h)_{1\leq p,h\leq k}$ is non vanishing for a.e. $(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in B(0,r)^k$.

Finally, in order to show that Condition (3.12) is satisfied it suffices to check that

$$\int_{B(0,r)^k} \left| \frac{\partial_{x_i^{(p)}} \det \widetilde{A}(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \partial_{x_j^{(q)}} \det \widetilde{A}(x_1, \ldots, x_k)}{\det \widetilde{A}(x_1, \ldots, x_k)} \right| \mathrm{d}x_1 \ldots \mathrm{d}x_k < \infty,$$

for all $k \geq 1$, $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ and $1 \leq p, q \leq 2$, or simply

$$\int_{B(0,r)^k} \left| \frac{\partial_{x_1^{(1)}} \det \widetilde{A}(x_1, \ldots, x_k)}{\det \widetilde{A}(x_1, \ldots, x_k)} \right| \mathrm{d}x_1 \ldots \mathrm{d}x_k < \infty,$$

for which it suffices to note that

$$\int_{B(0,r)} \frac{\mathrm{d}x^{(1)} \mathrm{d}x^{(2)}}{\sqrt{(x^{(1)} - a)^2 + (x^{(2)} - b)^2}} < \infty,$$

for all $(a, b) \in B(0, r)$.

# 4 Dirichlet forms

In this section we construct the symmetric Dirichlet form associated to a determinantal process in Theorem 4.1 below. We start by recalling some definitions related to bilinear forms (see [14] for details). Let $H$ be a Hilbert space with inner product $< \cdot, \cdot >$ and $\mathcal{A} : \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{A}) \times \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{A}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a bilinear form defined on a dense subspace $\mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{A})$ of $H$, the domain of $\mathcal{A}$. The form $\mathcal{A}$ is said to be symmetric if $\mathcal{A}(x, y) = \mathcal{A}(y, x)$, for any $x, y \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{A})$, and non-negative definite if $\mathcal{A}(x, x) \geq 0$, for any $x \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{A})$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be symmetric and non-negative definite, $\mathcal{A}$ is said closed if $\mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{A})$ equipped with the norm

$$\|x\|_{\mathcal{A}} := \sqrt{\mathcal{A}(x, x) + < x, x >}, \quad x \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{A}),$$

is a Hilbert space. A symmetric and non-negative definite bilinear form $\mathcal{A}$ is said closable if, for any sequence $(x_n)_{n\geq 1} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $x_n$ goes to 0 in $H$ and $(x_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is Cauchy *w.r.t.* $\| \cdot \|_{\mathcal{A}}$ it holds that $\mathcal{A}(x_n, x_n)$ converges to 0 in $\mathbb{R}$ as $n$ goes to infinity. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be closable and denote by $\mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{A}})$ the completion of $\mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{A})$ *w.r.t.* the norm $\| \cdot \|_{\mathcal{A}}$. It turns out that $\mathcal{A}$ is uniquely extended to $\mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{A}})$ by the closed, symmetric and non-negative definite bilinear form

$$\overline{\mathcal{A}}(x, y) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{A}(x_n, y_n), \quad (x, y) \in \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{A}}) \times \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{A}}),$$

where $\{(x_n, y_n)\}_{n\geq 1}$ is any sequence in $\mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{A}) \times \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $(x_n, y_n)$ converges to $(x, y) \in \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{A}}) \times \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{A}})$ *w.r.t.* the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}} + \|\cdot\|_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}$. A symmetric, non-negative definite and closed bilinear form $\mathcal{A}$ is said symmetric coercive closed form if the following weak sector condition is satisfied:

$$\exists \text{ a constant } c > 0 \text{ such that } |\mathcal{A}_1(x,y)| \leq c\mathcal{A}_1(x,x)^{1/2}\mathcal{A}_1(y,y)^{1/2}, \qquad x, y \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{A}), \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_1(x,y) := \mathcal{A}(x,y) + < x, y > .$$

Suppose $H = L^2(B, \mathcal{B}, \beta)$ where $(B, \mathcal{B}, \beta)$ is a measure space. In such a case a symmetric coercive closed form $\mathcal{A}$ is said to be a symmetric Dirichlet form if

$$\mathcal{A}(f^+ \wedge 1, f^+ \wedge 1) \leq \mathcal{A}(f, f), \qquad f \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{A}),$$

where $f^+$ denotes the positive part of $f$. Suppose that $B$ is a Hausdorff topological space and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a symmetric Dirichlet form. An $\mathcal{A}$-nest is an increasing sequence $(C_n)_{n\geq 1}$ of closed subsets of $B$ such that

$$\bigcup_{n\geq 1} \{f \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{A}) \colon \ f = 0 \ \beta\text{-a.e. on } B \setminus C_n\}$$

is dense in $\mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{A})$ *w.r.t.* the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{A}}$. We say that a subset $B' \subset B$ is $\mathcal{A}$-exceptional if there exists an $\mathcal{A}$-nest $(C_n)_{n\geq 1}$ with $B' \subset B \setminus \bigcup_{n\geq 1} C_n$. Throughout this paper we say that a property holds $\mathcal{A}$-almost everywhere ($\mathcal{A}$-a.e.) if it holds up to an $\mathcal{A}$-exceptional set. Moreover, a function $f : B \to \mathbb{R}$ is called $\mathcal{A}$-almost continuous ($\mathcal{A}$-a.c.) if there exists an $\mathcal{A}$-nest $(C_n)_{n\geq 1}$ such that the restriction $f_{|C_n}$ of $f$ to $C_n$ is continuous for each $n \geq 1$.

Let $B$ again a Hausdorff topological space. A symmetric Dirichlet form $\mathcal{A}$ on the Hilbert space $L^2(B, \mathcal{B}(B), \beta)$ is called quasi-regular if:
$(i)$ There exists an $\mathcal{A}$-nest $(C_n)_{n\geq 1}$ consisting of compact sets.
$(ii)$ There exists a $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{A}}$-dense subset of $\mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{A})$ whose elements have $\mathcal{A}$-a.c. $\beta$-versions.
$(iii)$ There exist $f_k \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{A})$, $k \geq 1$, having $\mathcal{A}$-a.c. $\beta$-versions $\tilde{f}_k$, $k \geq 1$, such that $(\tilde{f}_k)_{k\geq 1}$ is a separating set for $B \setminus N$ (i.e. for any $x, y \in B \setminus N$, $x \neq y$, there exists $\tilde{f}_{k^*}$ such that $\tilde{f}_{k^*}(x) \neq \tilde{f}_{k^*}(y)$), where $N$ is a subset of $B$ which is $\mathcal{A}$-exceptional.

We denote by $\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$ the set of non-negative integer-valued finite measures on $D$, equipped with the vague topology (recall that this topology is metrized by the so-called "d-hash" metric, see e.g. Appendix A2 pages 402-405 in [4]). For technical reasons, in this section and Section 5 we shall see $\mathrm{N}_f^D$, i.e. the set of finite point configurations on $D$, as a subspace of $\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$, via the identification

$$\mathbf{x} \equiv \sum_{x \in \mathbf{x}} \delta_x, \qquad \mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{N}_f^D,$$

where $\delta_x$ denotes the Dirac measure at $x \in D$. We shall denote by $\mathcal{B}(\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D)$ the corresponding Borel $\sigma$-field. Letting $\mathbf{X}$ denote a determinantal point process with kernel $K$, using obvious notation, we shall identify $\mathrm{L}_D^2$ with $\mathrm{L}^2(\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D, \mathcal{B}(\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D), P_{\mathbf{X}^D})$.

We consider the bilinear map $\mathcal{E}$ defined on $\mathcal{S}_D \times \mathcal{S}_D$ by

$$\mathcal{E}(F(\mathbf{X}^D), G(\mathbf{X}^D)) := \mathrm{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N(D)} \nabla_{X_i}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} F(\mathbf{X}^D) \cdot \nabla_{X_i}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} G(\mathbf{X}^D)\right].$$

For $F(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \mathcal{S}_D$ of the form (3.1), i.e.

$$F(\mathbf{X}^D) = f_0 \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=0\}} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}} f_k(X_1, \ldots, X_k)$$

we also define the linear Laplace operator $\mathcal{H}$ on the space of determinantal processes by

$$\mathcal{H}F(\mathbf{X}^D) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \left(-\beta^{\mu}(X_i) \cdot \nabla_{x_i} f_k(X_1, \ldots, X_k) - \Delta_{x_i} f_k(X_1, \ldots, X_k) + U_{i,k}(X_1, \ldots, X_k) \cdot \nabla_{x_i} f_k(X_1, \ldots, X_k)\right),$$

where $\Delta = -\mathrm{div}\nabla$ denotes the Laplacian operator.

In the following, we consider the subspace $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D$ of $\mathcal{S}_D$ made of r.v.'s $F(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \mathcal{S}_D$ of the form

$$F(\mathbf{X}^D) = f\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \varphi_1(X_k), \ldots, \sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \varphi_M(X_k)\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D) \le K\}},$$

for some integers $M, K \ge 1$, $\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_M \in \mathcal{C}_c^{\infty}(D)$, $f \in \mathcal{C}_b^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^M)$. Note that $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D$ is dense in $\mathrm{L}_D^2$ (see e.g. [14] p. 54).

The next Theorem 4.1 provides the Dirichlet form associated to a determinantal process.

**Theorem 4.1** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.2, we have:*
*(i) The linear operator* $\mathcal{H} : \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D \longrightarrow \mathrm{L}_D^2$ *is symmetric, non-negative definite and well-defined, i.e.* $\mathcal{H}(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D) \subset \mathrm{L}_D^2$. *In particular the operator square root* $\mathcal{H}^{1/2}$ *of* $\mathcal{H}$ *exists.*

*$(ii)$ The bilinear form $\mathcal{E} : \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D \times \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is symmetric, non-negative definite and well-defined, i.e. $\mathcal{E}(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D \times \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D) \subset \mathbb{R}$.*

*$(iii)$ $\mathcal{H}^{1/2}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ are closable and the following relation holds:*

$$\overline{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{G}) = \mathrm{E}[\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}\,\mathbf{F}\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}\,\mathbf{G}], \quad \forall\ \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{G} \in \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}). \tag{4.2}$$

*$(iv)$ The bilinear form $(\overline{\mathcal{E}}, \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}))$ is a symmetric Dirichlet form.*

*Proof.* The proof of this theorem is based on Lemma 4.2 below.

$(i)$ By Relation (4.4) in Lemma 4.2 we easily deduce that, for any $F(\mathbf{X}^D), G(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D$ we have

$$\mathrm{E}[G(\mathbf{X}^D)\mathcal{H}F(\mathbf{X}^D)] = \mathrm{E}[F(\mathbf{X}^D)\mathcal{H}G(\mathbf{X}^D)] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{E}[F(\mathbf{X}^D)\mathcal{H}F(\mathbf{X}^D)] \geq 0.$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{H}$ is symmetric and non-negative definite. It remains to check that, under the foregoing assumptions, $\mathcal{H}$ is well-defined. Let $F(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D$ be of the form

$$\begin{aligned} F(\mathbf{X}^D) &= \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}} h\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \varphi_1(X_i), \ldots, \sum_{i=1}^{k} \varphi_m(X_i)\right) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}} h_k(X_1, \ldots, X_k) \end{aligned}$$

for some integers $m, n \geq 1$, $\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_m \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(D)$, $h \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$. By the definition of $\mathcal{H}$, for the well-definiteness of $\mathcal{H}$ we only need to check that $\|\mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}} B^{\mu}_{\nabla_{x_i} h_k}(\mathbf{X}^D)\|_{\mathrm{L}^2_D} < \infty$ and $\|\mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}} \nabla^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}_{\nabla_{x_i} h_k} U(\mathbf{X}^D)\|_{\mathrm{L}^2_D} < \infty$. The assumptions guarantee these relations, cf. the proof of Theorem 3.2.

$(ii)$ The symmetry and non-negative definiteness of $\mathcal{E}$ follow from Lemma 4.2 below. It remains to check that, under the foregoing assumptions, $\mathcal{E}$ is well-defined. By Step $(i)$, for any $F(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D$, we have $\mathcal{H}F(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \mathrm{L}^2_D$. We conclude the proof by noting that, by Lemma 4.2, for any $F(\mathbf{X}^D), G(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D$ and some positive constant $c > 0$, we have

$$|\mathcal{E}(F(\mathbf{X}^D), G(\mathbf{X}^D))| = |\mathrm{E}[G(\mathbf{X}^D)\mathcal{H}F(\mathbf{X}^D)]| \leq c\|\mathcal{H}F(\mathbf{X}^D)\|_{\mathrm{L}^2_D} < \infty.$$

$(iii)$ We first show that $\mathcal{E}$ is closable. We apply Lemma 3.4 page 29 in [14]. We start checking that $\mathcal{E}$ satisfies the weak sector condition (4.1). By Relation (4.5) in Lemma 4.2 we have, for any $F(\mathbf{X}^D), G(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D$,

$$|\mathcal{E}_1(F(\mathbf{X}^D), G(\mathbf{X}^D))| = |\mathrm{E}[\mathcal{H}^{1/2}F(\mathbf{X}^D)\mathcal{H}^{1/2}G(\mathbf{X}^D)] + \mathrm{E}[G(\mathbf{X}^D)F(\mathbf{X}^D)]|$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\leq \|\mathcal{H}^{1/2}F(\mathbf{X}^D)\|_{\mathrm{L}^2_D}\|\mathcal{H}^{1/2}G(\mathbf{X}^D)\|_{\mathrm{L}^2_D} + \|F(\mathbf{X}^D)\|_{\mathrm{L}^2_D}\|G(\mathbf{X}^D)\|_{\mathrm{L}^2_D}\\ &\leq 2\mathcal{E}_1(F(\mathbf{X}^D), F(\mathbf{X}^D))^{1/2}\mathcal{E}_1(G(\mathbf{X}^D), G(\mathbf{X}^D))^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

It remains to check that if $(F_n(\mathbf{X}^D))_{n\geq 1} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D$ is such that $F_n(\mathbf{X}^D)$ converges to 0 in $\mathrm{L}^2_D$, then $\mathcal{E}(G(\mathbf{X}^D), F_n(\mathbf{X}^D))$ converges to 0, for any $G(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D$. This easily follows by Lemma 4.2, the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the fact that $\mathcal{H}G(\mathbf{X}^D)$ is square integrable (see the proof of Step $(i)$). The closability of $\mathcal{H}^{1/2}$ follows by the closability of $\mathcal{E}$, Relation (4.5) in Lemma 4.2 and Remark 3.2 $(i)$ page 29 in [14].

Finally, we prove Relation (4.2). Take $\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{G} \in \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}})$ and let $(F_n(\mathbf{X}^D))_{n\geq 1}$, $(G_n(\mathbf{X}^D))_{n\geq 1}$ be sequences in $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D$ such that $F_n(\mathbf{X}^D)$ converges to $\mathbf{F}$, $G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)$ converges to $\mathbf{G}$, $\mathcal{H}^{1/2}F_n(\mathbf{X}^D)$ converges to $\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}\,\mathbf{F}$, and $\mathcal{H}^{1/2}G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)$ converges to $\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}\,\mathbf{G}$ in $\mathrm{L}^2_D$ as $n$ goes to infinity. By Lemma 4.2 we have

$$\mathcal{E}(F_n(\mathbf{X}^D), G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)) = \mathrm{E}[\mathcal{H}^{1/2}F_n(\mathbf{X}^D)\mathcal{H}^{1/2}G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)], \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1.$$

The claim follows if we prove

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{E}[\mathcal{H}^{1/2}F_n(\mathbf{X}^D)\mathcal{H}^{1/2}G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)] = \mathrm{E}[\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}\,\mathbf{F}\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}\,\mathbf{G}].$$

We have:

$$\begin{aligned}&|\mathrm{E}[\mathcal{H}^{1/2}G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)\mathcal{H}^{1/2}F_n(\mathbf{X}^D)] - \mathrm{E}[\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}\mathbf{G}\,\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}\,\mathbf{F}]|\\ &= |\mathrm{E}[\mathcal{H}^{1/2}G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)\mathcal{H}^{1/2}F_n(\mathbf{X}^D)] - \mathrm{E}[\mathcal{H}^{1/2}G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)\,\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}\,\mathbf{F}]\\ &\qquad\qquad + \mathrm{E}[\mathcal{H}^{1/2}G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)\,\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}\,\mathbf{F}] - \mathrm{E}[\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}\mathbf{G}\,\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}\,\mathbf{F}]|\\ &\leq |\mathrm{E}[\mathcal{H}^{1/2}G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)(\mathcal{H}^{1/2}F_n(\mathbf{X}^D) - \overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}\,\mathbf{F})]| + |\mathrm{E}[(\mathcal{H}^{1/2}G_n(\mathbf{X}^D) - \overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}\mathbf{G})\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}\,\mathbf{F}]|\\ &\leq \|\mathcal{H}^{1/2}G_n(\mathbf{X}^D)\|_{\mathrm{L}^2_D}\|\mathcal{H}^{1/2}F_n(\mathbf{X}^D) - \overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}\,\mathbf{F}\|_{\mathrm{L}^2_D}\\ &\qquad\qquad + \|\mathcal{H}^{1/2}G_n(\mathbf{X}^D) - \overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}\mathbf{G}\|_{\mathrm{L}^2_D}\|\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}\,\mathbf{F}\|_{\mathrm{L}^2_D} \to 0, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.\end{aligned}$$

$(iv)$ The bilinear form $(\overline{\mathcal{E}}, \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}))$ defined by (4.2) is clearly symmetric, non-negative definite, and closed. Using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and equality (4.2) (i.e. reasoning similarly as the first part of Step $(iii)$) it is easily checked that the weak sector condition (4.1) holds. So by Definition 2.4 page 16 in [14] we have that $(\overline{\mathcal{E}}, \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}))$ is a symmetric coercive closed form. We conclude the proof by applying Proposition 4.10 page 35 in [14]. First note that $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D$ is dense in $\mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}})$ (*w.r.t.* the norm $\overline{\mathcal{E}}_1^{1/2}$). By Exercise 2.7 page 47 in [14], for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an infinitely differentiable function $\varphi_\varepsilon : \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow [-\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon]$

(which has not to be confused with the functions $\varphi_1,\ldots,\varphi_M$ involved in the definition of the r.v. $F(\mathbf{X}^D)$ below) such that $\varphi_\varepsilon(t)=t$ for any $t\in[0,1]$, $0\le\varphi_\varepsilon(t)-\varphi_\varepsilon(s)\le t-s$ for all $t,s\in\mathbb{R}$, $t\ge s$, $\varphi_\varepsilon(t)=1+\varepsilon$ for $t\in[1+2\varepsilon,\infty)$ and $\varphi_\varepsilon(t)=-\varepsilon$ for $t\in(-\infty,-2\varepsilon]$. Note that $|\varphi'_\varepsilon(t)|^2\le 1$ for any $\varepsilon>0$, $t\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi_\varepsilon$ is in $\mathcal{C}_b^\infty$, for any $\varepsilon>0$. Consider the r.v.

$$F(\mathbf{X}^D)=f\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)}\varphi_1(X_k),\ldots,\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)}\varphi_M(X_k)\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)\le K\}},$$

for some integers $M,K\ge 1$, $\varphi_1,\ldots,\varphi_M\in\mathcal{C}_c^\infty(D)$, $f\in\mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^M)$. Note that $F(\mathbf{X}^D),\varphi_\varepsilon\circ F(\mathbf{X}^D)\in\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D$. Indeed

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_\varepsilon\circ F(\mathbf{X}^D)&=\varphi_\varepsilon\left(f\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)}\varphi_1(X_k),\ldots,\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)}\varphi_M(X_k)\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)\le K\}}\right)\\&=\varphi_\varepsilon\left(f\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)}\varphi_1(X_k),\ldots,\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)}\varphi_M(X_k)\right)\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)\le K\}},\end{aligned}$$

because $\varphi_\varepsilon(0)=0$. By Lemma 4.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\overline{\mathcal{E}}(\varphi_\varepsilon\circ F(\mathbf{X}^D),\varphi_\varepsilon\circ F(\mathbf{X}^D))=\mathrm{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N(D)}\nabla_{X_i}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}\varphi_\varepsilon\circ F(\mathbf{X}^D)\cdot\nabla_{X_i}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}\varphi_\varepsilon\circ F(\mathbf{X}^D)\right]\\&=\mathrm{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N(D)}\|\nabla_{X_i}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}\varphi_\varepsilon\circ F(\mathbf{X}^D)\|^2\right]\\&=\mathrm{E}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{K}\mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\|\nabla_{X_i}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}\varphi_\varepsilon\circ F(\mathbf{X}^D)\|^2\right]\\&=\mathrm{E}\Bigg[\sum_{k=1}^{K}\mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\Bigg\|\sum_{m=1}^{M}\varphi'_\varepsilon\circ f\left(\sum_{l=1}^{k}\varphi_1(X_l),\ldots,\sum_{l=1}^{k}\varphi_M(X_l)\right)\\&\qquad\qquad\times\partial_m f\left(\sum_{l=1}^{k}\varphi_1(X_l),\ldots,\sum_{l=1}^{k}\varphi_M(X_l)\right)\nabla\varphi_m(X_i)\Bigg\|^2\Bigg]\\&\le\mathrm{E}\Bigg[\sum_{k=1}^{K}\mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\Bigg\|\sum_{m=1}^{M}\partial_m f\left(\sum_{l=1}^{k}\varphi_1(X_l),\ldots,\sum_{l=1}^{k}\varphi_M(X_l)\right)\nabla\varphi_m(X_i)\Bigg\|^2\Bigg]\qquad(4.3)\\&=\overline{\mathcal{E}}(F(\mathbf{X}^D),F(\mathbf{X}^D)),\end{aligned}$$

where in (4.3) we used the fact that $|\varphi'_\varepsilon(t)|^2\le 1$, $t\in\mathbb{R}$. By this inequality we easily have, for any $F(\mathbf{X}^D)\in\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D$,

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}\overline{\mathcal{E}}(F(\mathbf{X}^D)\pm\varphi_\varepsilon\circ F(\mathbf{X}^D),F(\mathbf{X}^D)\mp\varphi_\varepsilon\circ F(\mathbf{X}^D))\ge 0$$

and the proof is completed (since, as required by Proposition 4.10 page 35 in [14], we checked condition (4.6) page 34 in [14]). Indeed, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, by the above inequality and the symmetry of $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\overline{\mathcal{E}}(F(\mathbf{X}^D) + \varphi_\varepsilon \circ F(\mathbf{X}^D), F(\mathbf{X}^D) - \varphi_\varepsilon \circ F(\mathbf{X}^D)) \\
&= \overline{\mathcal{E}}(F(\mathbf{X}^D) - \varphi_\varepsilon \circ F(\mathbf{X}^D), F(\mathbf{X}^D) + \varphi_\varepsilon \circ F(\mathbf{X}^D)) \\
&= \mathrm{E}[(F(\mathbf{X}^D) - \varphi_\varepsilon \circ F(\mathbf{X}^D))\mathcal{H}(F(\mathbf{X}^D) + \varphi_\varepsilon \circ F(\mathbf{X}^D))] \\
&= \mathrm{E}[F(\mathbf{X}^D)\mathcal{H}F(\mathbf{X}^D) + F(\mathbf{X}^D)\mathcal{H}\varphi_\varepsilon \circ F(\mathbf{X}^D) \\
&\qquad - \varphi_\varepsilon \circ F(\mathbf{X}^D)\mathcal{H}F(\mathbf{X}^D) - \varphi_\varepsilon \circ F(\mathbf{X}^D)\mathcal{H}\varphi_\varepsilon \circ F(\mathbf{X}^D)] \\
&\geq \mathrm{E}[F(\mathbf{X}^D)\mathcal{H}\varphi_\varepsilon \circ F(\mathbf{X}^D) - \varphi_\varepsilon \circ F(\mathbf{X}^D)\mathcal{H}F(\mathbf{X}^D)] \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 4.2** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.2, for any $F(\mathbf{X}^D), G(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N(D)} \nabla_{X_i}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} F(\mathbf{X}^D) \cdot \nabla_{X_i}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} G(\mathbf{X}^D)\right] &= \mathrm{E}[G(\mathbf{X}^D)\mathcal{H}F(\mathbf{X}^D)] \qquad (4.4) \\
&= \mathrm{E}[\mathcal{H}^{1/2}F(\mathbf{X}^D)\mathcal{H}^{1/2}G(\mathbf{X}^D)]. \qquad (4.5)
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Let $F(\mathbf{X}^D), G(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D$ be, respectively, of the form

$$F(\mathbf{X}^D) = f\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \varphi_1(X_k), \ldots, \sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \varphi_{M_1}(X_k)\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D) \leq K_1\}},$$

$$G(\mathbf{X}^D) = g\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \gamma_1(X_k), \ldots, \sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \gamma_{M_2}(X_k)\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D) \leq K_2\}},$$

for some integers $M_1, M_2, K_1, K_2 \geq 1$, $\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_{M_1}, \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{M_2} \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(D)$, $f \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{M_1})$, $g \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{M_2})$. Define

$$F_i(\mathbf{X}^D) = \partial_i f\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \varphi_1(X_k), \ldots, \sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \varphi_{M_1}(X_k)\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D) \leq K_1\}},$$

and

$$v_i(x) = \nabla\varphi_i(x), \quad x \in S.$$

By direct computation we find

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}F(\mathbf{X}^D) = &-\mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)\leq K_1\}} \sum_{i=1}^{M_1} \sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \beta^\mu(X_k)\cdot v_i(X_k)\partial_i f\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)}\varphi_1(X_k),\dots,\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)}\varphi_{M_1}(X_k)\right)\\
&-\mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)\leq K_1\}} \sum_{i,j=1}^{M_1} \sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} v_i(X_k)\sum_{l=1}^{N(D)} v_j(X_l)\partial_i\partial_j f\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)}\varphi_1(X_k),\dots,\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)}\varphi_{M_1}(X_k)\right)\\
&+\mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)\leq K_1\}} \sum_{i=1}^{M_1} \sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \operatorname{div} v_i(X_k)\partial_i f\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)}\varphi_1(X_k),\dots,\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)}\varphi_{M_1}(X_k)\right)\\
&+\mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)\leq K_1\}} \sum_{i=1}^{M_1} \sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} U_{k,N(D)}(X_1,\dots,X_{N(D)})\cdot v_i(X_k)\partial_i f\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)}\varphi_1(X_k),\dots,\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)}\varphi_{M_1}(X_k)\right)\\
= \quad &-\sum_{i=1}^{M_1} F_i(\mathbf{X}^D)\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)}\beta^\mu(X_k)\cdot v_i(X_k)\\
&-\mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)\leq K_1\}} \sum_{i,j=1}^{M_1} \sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} v_i(X_k)\sum_{l=1}^{N(D)} v_j(X_l)\partial_i\partial_j f\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)}\varphi_1(X_k),\dots,\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)}\varphi_{M_1}(X_k)\right)\\
&+\sum_{i=1}^{M_1} F_i(\mathbf{X}^D)\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)}\operatorname{div} v_i(X_k)\\
&+\sum_{i=1}^{M_1} F_i(\mathbf{X}^D)\nabla_{v_i}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} U(\mathbf{X}^D),
\end{aligned}
$$

which yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}F(\mathbf{X}^D) &= \sum_{i=1}^{M_1}\Big(-\nabla_{v_i}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}F_i(\mathbf{X}^D) + (B_{v_i}^\mu(\mathbf{X}^D) + \nabla_{v_i}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}U(\mathbf{X}^D))F_i(\mathbf{X}^D)\Big)\\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{M_1}\nabla_{v_i}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}*}F_i(\mathbf{X}^D).
\end{aligned}
$$

So, by Lemma 3.1 and since $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D \subset \mathcal{S}_D$, using obvious notation we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}[G(\mathbf{X}^D)\mathcal{H}F(\mathbf{X}^D)] &= \sum_{i=1}^{M_1}\mathrm{E}\left[G(\mathbf{X}^D)\nabla_{v_i}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}*}F_i(\mathbf{X}^D)\right] = \sum_{i=1}^{M_1}\mathrm{E}\left[F_i(\mathbf{X}^D)\nabla_{v_i}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}G(\mathbf{X}^D)\right]\\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{M_1}\mathrm{E}\left[F_i(\mathbf{X}^D)\sum_{l=1}^{N(D)}\sum_{j=1}^{M_2}\partial_j g\left(\sum_{m=1}^{N(D)}\gamma_1(X_m),\dots,\sum_{m=1}^{N(D)}\gamma_{M_2}(X_m)\right)\nabla\gamma_j(X_l)\cdot\nabla\varphi_i(X_l)\right]\\
&= \mathrm{E}\left[\sum_{l=1}^{N(D)}\sum_{i=1}^{M_1}F_i(\mathbf{X}^D)\nabla\varphi_i(X_l)\cdot\sum_{j=1}^{M_2}G_j(\mathbf{X}^D)\nabla\gamma_j(X_l)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

$$= \mathrm{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N(D)} \nabla_{X_i}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} F(\mathbf{X}^D) \cdot \nabla_{X_i}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} G(\mathbf{X}^D)\right].$$

Finally, since $\mathcal{H}$ is symmetric and non-negative definite the square root operator $\mathcal{H}^{1/2}$ is well-defined. Relation (4.5) follows by the properties of $\mathcal{H}^{1/2}$. $\square$

We conclude this subsection with the following remark which provides the semigroup of the Dirichlet form $(\overline{\mathcal{E}}, \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}))$. The connection between such semigroup and the transition semigroup of the diffusion associated to the determinantal process will be specified in Theorem 5.1 below.

**Remark 4.3** *Assume the hypotheses of Theorem 3.2. Then* $(\overline{\mathcal{E}}, \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}))$ *is a symmetric Dirichlet form. Its generator is by definition the linear operator* $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{gen}}\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{G}$*, where* $\mathbf{G}$ *is determined by the domain of the operator*:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{gen}})\\ &:= \left\{\mathbf{F} \in \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}) :\ \exists\, \mathbf{G} \in \mathrm{L}^2_D\, \forall \mathbf{Z} \in \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}})\ \overline{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{Z}) = -\mathrm{E}[\mathbf{G}\mathbf{Z}]\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

*One may easily see that the operator* $(-\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{gen}}, \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{gen}}))$ *is symmetric, non-negative definite and extends* $(\mathcal{H}, \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D)$*. Moreover*

$$\mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}) = \mathrm{Dom}\left((-\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{gen}})^{1/2}\right)$$

*and*

$$\overline{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{G}) = \mathrm{E}[(-\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{gen}})^{1/2}\, \mathbf{F} (-\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{gen}})^{1/2}\, \mathbf{G}], \quad \forall\ \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{G} \in \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}).$$

*By definition, the symmetric semi-group of* $(\overline{\mathcal{E}}, \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}))$ *is the linear operator* $T_t\mathbf{F} := \exp(t\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{gen}})\mathbf{F}$*,* $t > 0$*,* $\mathbf{F} \in \mathrm{L}^2_D$ *(which is defined by the spectral theory for symmetric operators on a Hilbert space).*

# 5 Stochastic dynamics and quasi-regularity

In this section we establish the existence of diffusions corresponding to determinantal point processes associated to the Dirichlet form $(\overline{\mathcal{E}}, \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}))$, cf. Theorem 5.1 below.

### Associated diffusion process

We start recalling some notions, see Chapters IV and V in [14]. Given $\pi$ in the set $\mathcal{P}(\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D)$ of the probability measures on $(\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D, \mathcal{B}(\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D))$, we call a $\pi$-stochastic process with state space $\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$ the collection

$$\mathbf{M}_{D,\pi} = (\mathbf{\Omega}, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}, (\mathbf{M}_t)_{t\geq 0}, (\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x}\in\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D}, \mathbf{P}_\pi)$$

where $\mathcal{F} := \bigvee_{t\geq 0} \mathcal{F}_t$ is a $\sigma$-field on the set $\mathbf{\Omega}$, $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is the $P_\pi$-completed filtration generated by the process $\mathbf{M}_t : \mathbf{\Omega} \longrightarrow \ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$ of $\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{B}(\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D)$-measurable mappings, $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is a probability measure on $(\mathbf{\Omega}, \mathcal{F})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$, and $P_\pi$ is the probability measure on $(\mathbf{\Omega}, \mathcal{F})$ defined by

$$\mathbf{P}_\pi(A) := \int_{\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}(A)\, \pi(\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}), \quad A \in \mathcal{F}.$$

A collection $(\mathbf{M}_{D,\pi}, (\theta_t)_{t\geq 0})$ is called a $\pi$-time homogeneous Markov process with state space $\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$ if $\theta_t : \mathbf{\Omega} \longrightarrow \mathbf{\Omega}$ is a shift operator, i.e. $\mathbf{M}_s \circ \theta_t = \mathbf{M}_{s+t}$, $s, t \geq 0$, the map $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}(A)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D) - \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$-measurable for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$, and the time homogeneous Markov property

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{M}_t \in A \,|\, \mathcal{F}_s) = \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{M}_s}(\mathbf{M}_{t-s} \in A), \qquad \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}} - a.s., \quad A \in \mathcal{F}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq t, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D,$$

holds. Recall that a $\pi$-time homogeneous Markov process $(\mathbf{M}_{D,\pi}, (\theta_t)_{t\geq 0})$ with state space $\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$ is said to be $\pi$-tight on $\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$ if $(\mathbf{M}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is right-continuous with left limits $\mathbf{P}_\pi$-almost surely; $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{M}_0 = \mathbf{x}) = 1\ \forall\ \mathbf{x} \in \ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$; the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is right continuous; the following strong Markov property holds:

$$\mathbf{P}_{\pi'}(\mathbf{M}_{t+\tau} \in A \,|\, \mathcal{F}_\tau) = \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{M}_\tau}(\mathbf{M}_t \in A)$$

$\mathbf{P}_{\pi'}$-almost surely for all $\mathcal{F}_t$-stopping time $\tau$, $\pi' \in \mathcal{P}(\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D)$, $A \in \mathcal{F}$ and $t \geq 0$, cf. Theorem IV.1.15 in [14]. In addition, a $\pi$-tight process on $\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$ is said $\pi$-special standard process on $\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$ if for any $\pi' \in \mathcal{P}(\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D)$ which is equivalent to $\pi$ and all $\mathcal{F}_t$-stopping times $\tau$, $(\tau_n)_{n\geq 1}$ such that $\tau_n \uparrow \tau$ then $\mathbf{M}_{\tau_n}$ converges to $\mathbf{M}_\tau$, $\mathbf{P}_{\pi'}$-almost surely.

The following theorem holds, in which $\mathrm{E}_{\mathbf{x}}$ denotes the expectation under $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$.

**Theorem 5.1** *Assume the hypotheses of Theorem 3.2. Then there exists a $P_{\mathbf{X}^D}$-tight special standard process $(\mathbf{M}_{D,P_{\mathbf{X}^D}}, (\theta_t)_{t\geq 0})$ on $\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$ with transition semigroup*

$$p_t f(\mathbf{x}) := \mathrm{E}_{\mathbf{x}}[f(\mathbf{M}_t)], \quad \mathbf{x} \in \ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D, \quad f : \ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad \textit{square integrable.}$$

*In addition,* $(\mathbf{M}_{D,P_{\mathbf{X}^D}},(\theta_t)_{t\geq 0})$ *is properly associated with the Dirichlet form* $(\overline{\mathcal{E}},\mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}))$ *in the sense that* $p_t f$ *is an* $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$*-a.c.,* $P_{\mathbf{X}^D}$*-version of* $\exp(t\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{gen}})f$ *for all square integrable* $f:\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D\longrightarrow\mathbb{R}$ *and* $t>0$*, and such that*

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}(\{\omega:\ t\mapsto\mathbf{M}_t(\omega)\ \textit{is continuous on}\ [0,+\infty)\})=1,\qquad \overline{\mathcal{E}}\textit{-a.e.},\ \mathbf{x}\in\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D. \tag{5.1}$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 5.2 below the Dirichlet form $(\overline{\mathcal{E}},\mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}))$ is quasi-regular, hence by Theorem III.3.5 page 103 in [14], there exists a $P_{\mathbf{X}^D}$-tight special standard process on $\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$, say $(\mathbf{M}_{D,P_{\mathbf{X}^D}},(\theta_t)_{t\geq 0})$, whose transition semigroup $(p_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is such that, for any square integrable function $f:\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D\longrightarrow\mathbb{R}$ and $t>0$, $p_t f$ is a $P_{\mathbf{X}^D}$-version of $\exp(t\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{gen}})f$ and $p_t f$ is $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$-a.c.. Since the form has the local property, by Theorem V.1.5 page 150 in [14] the tight special standard process is a $P_{\mathbf{X}^D}$-diffusion associated to the form, i.e. relation (5.1) holds for $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$-a.e. $\mathbf{x}\in\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$. □

For the sake of completeness we remark that by applying Theorem 6.4 page 141 in [14], one has that the $P_{\mathbf{X}^D}$-diffusion on $\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$ properly associated with the Dirichlet form $(\overline{\mathcal{E}},\mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}))$ (defined in Theorem 5.1) is unique up to $P_{\mathbf{X}^D}$-equivalence. We refer the reader to Definition 6.3 page 140 in [14] for the meaning of this notion.

### Quasi-regularity and locality

The following lemma holds.

**Lemma 5.2** *Assume the hypotheses of Theorem 3.2. Then the form* $(\overline{\mathcal{E}},\mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}))$ *is quasi-regular and local* (*i.e.* $\overline{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{F},\mathbf{G})=0$ *for any* $\mathbf{F},\mathbf{G}\in\mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}})$ *such that* $\mathrm{supp}(|\mathbf{F}|P)\cap\mathrm{supp}(|\mathbf{G}|P)=\emptyset$).

*Proof.* Quasi-regularity. As in [21] and [22], we apply Theorem 3.4 of [15]. For this purpose, we have to show that, for some countable dense set $(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_i)_{i\geq 1}$ in $\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$, there exists a countable collection $(F_{ij}(\mathbf{X}^D))_{i,j\geq 1}$ of random variables such that:
$(i)$ For some bounded metric $\varrho$ on $\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$, which is uniformly equivalent to the "d-hash" metric, we have $\varrho(\mathbf{x},\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_i)=\sup_j F_{ij}(\mathbf{x})$, $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$-a.e. $\mathbf{x}\in\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$, for any $i\geq 1$.
$(ii)$ $F_{ij}:\mathrm{N}_{lf}\longrightarrow\mathbb{R}$ is of the form

$$F_{ij}(\mathbf{x})=f_{ij}\left(\sum_{x\in\mathbf{x}}h_1(x),\ldots,\sum_{x\in\mathbf{x}}h_N(x)\right),\quad \mathbf{x}\in\mathrm{N}_{lf}$$

for some integer $N \geq 1$, $h_1, \ldots, h_N \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(S)$ and $f_{ij}$ weakly differentiable; $(F_{ij}(\mathbf{X}^D))_{i,j\geq 1} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}})$ and, setting $\mathbf{F}_{ij} = F_{ij}(\mathbf{X}^D)$,

$$\overline{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{F}_{ij}, \mathbf{F}_{ij}) = \mathrm{E}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \|\nabla_{X_k}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} F_{ij}(\mathbf{X}^D)\|^2\right], \tag{5.2}$$

where $\nabla_x^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} F_{ij}(\mathbf{x})$ is defined as in (3.2) with $n = \infty$ and the symbol $\nabla_x$ being the gradient w.r.t. the weak partial derivatives.

$(iii)$ $\sup_{i,j} \sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \|\nabla_{X_k}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} F_{ij}(\mathbf{X}^D)\|^2 \in \mathrm{L}_D^1$.

*Proof of* $(i)$. Such a metric $\varrho$ is defined as the restriction on $\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$ of the following metric on $\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_{lf}$ (which we continue to denote by $\varrho$) constructed in [22] as follows. Here $\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_{lf}$ denotes the set of non-negative integer-valued locally finite measures on $S$, equipped with the vague topology. Let $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{b}}$ be a countable open base in $S$ and, for every $O \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{b}}$, take a sequence $\ell_{O_1}, \ell_{O_2}, \ldots \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(S)$ such that $\ell_{O_n}(x) \uparrow \mathbf{1}_{\{x\in O\}}$, $\forall\, x \in S$. For ease of notation set $\ell_n = \ell_{O_n}$ and assume that this enumeration satisfies

$$\bigcup_{k=1}^{j} \mathrm{supp}(\ell_k) \subseteq \{x \in S : \ \|x\| \leq j\}, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots.$$

The desired metric is defined by

$$\varrho(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \sup_j 2^{-j} \left\{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\left|\sum_{x\in\mathbf{x}} \ell_j(x) - \sum_{y\in\mathbf{y}} \ell_j(y)\right|}{\overline{\ell}_j}\right)\right\}, \quad \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \ddot{\mathrm{N}}_{lf}$$

where, for $x = (x^{(1)}, \ldots, x^{(d)})$,

$$\overline{\ell}_j := \sup\left\{\left|\frac{\partial \ell_j(x)}{\partial x^{(q)}}\right| : \ x \in S,\ q = 1, \ldots, d\right\} > 0.$$

Let $(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_i)_{i\geq 1}$ be a countable dense set in $\ddot{\mathrm{N}}_f^D$ and define

$$F_{ij}(\mathbf{x}) := 2^{-j} \left\{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\left|\sum_{x\in\mathbf{x}} \ell_j(x) - \sum_{\widetilde{x}_i\in\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_i} \ell_j(\widetilde{x}_i)\right|}{\overline{\ell}_j}\right)\right\}, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \ddot{\mathrm{N}}_{lf}.$$

Then $(i)$ follows.

*Proof of* $(ii)$. Clearly $F_{ij}$ has the claimed form. We now check that $\mathbf{F}_{ij} \in \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}})$, i.e. there exists a sequence $(F_{ij}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}^D))_{n\geq 1} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D$ such that, as $n$ goes to infinity, $F_{ij}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}^D)$ converges to $\mathbf{F}_{ij}$ in $\mathrm{L}_D^2$ and $(\mathcal{H}^{1/2} F_{ij}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}^D))_{n\geq 1}$ converges in $\mathrm{L}_D^2$. Define the function

$$\overline{f}_{ij}(x) := \left|x - \sum_{\widetilde{x}_i\in\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_i} \ell_j(\widetilde{x}_i)\right|, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}$$

and consider the classical sequence of mollifiers defined by $\eta_n(x) := Cn\eta(nx)$, $n \geq 1$, where

$$\eta(x) := \mathbf{1}_{\{|x|<1\}} \mathrm{e}^{-1/(1-x^2)}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}$$

and $C := \left(\int_{-1}^{1} \eta(x)\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{-1}$. Define the functions

$$f_{ij}^{(n)}(x) := 2^{-j} \left\{ 1 - \exp\left( - \frac{\eta_n * \overline{f}_{ij}(x)}{\overline{\ell}_j} \right) \right\}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}$$

where $*$ denotes the convolution product, and set $F_{ij}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) := f_{ij}^{(n)}\left(\sum_{x\in\mathbf{x}} \ell_j(x)\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\sharp(\mathbf{x})\leq n\}}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{N}_f^D$, where the symbol $\sharp(\mathbf{x})$ denotes the number of points in the configuration $\mathbf{x}$. Since $\eta_n \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and $\overline{f}_{ij}$ is locally integrable on $\mathbb{R}$, we have $\eta_n * \overline{f}_{ij} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ (see e.g. Proposition IV.20 in [2]). Therefore $f_{ij}^{(n)} \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and so $F_{ij}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D$. Since $\overline{f}_{ij} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R})$, we deduce that $\eta_n * \overline{f}_{ij}$ converges to $\overline{f}_{ij}$ uniformly on the compacts of $\mathbb{R}$ (see e.g. Proposition IV.21 in [2]), and so $F_{ij}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}^D)$ converges to $\mathbf{F}_{ij}$ in $\mathrm{L}_D^2$, as $n$ goes to infinity. It remains to show that the sequence $(\mathcal{H}^{1/2} F_{ij}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}^D))_{n\geq 1}$ converges in $\mathrm{L}_D^2$. For this we are going to prove that it is a Cauchy sequence. We preliminary note that since $\eta_n$ is integrable on $\mathbb{R}$ and $\overline{f}_{ij}$ is weakly differentiable we have (see e.g. Lemma VIII.4 in [2])

$$(\eta_n * \overline{f}_{ij})'(x) := \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x} \eta_n * \overline{f}_{ij}(x) = \eta_n * \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x} \overline{f}_{ij}(x)$$

where

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x} \overline{f}_{ij}(x) = \mathbf{1}_{\left\{\sum_{\widetilde{x}_i \in \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_i} \ell_j(\widetilde{x}_i) \in (x,\infty)\right\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\left\{\sum_{\widetilde{x}_i \in \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_i} \ell_j(\widetilde{x}_i) \in (-\infty,x)\right\}}.$$

Thus $|(\eta_n * \overline{f}_{ij})'| \leq 1$, for any $n \geq 1$. Moreover, $(\eta_n * \overline{f}_{ij})'(x)$ converges to $\overline{f}_{ij}'(x)$ point-wise, as $n$ goes to infinity. We also note that for any $n \geq 1$ and $x \in D$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_x^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} F_{ij}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}^D) &= \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)=k\}} \sum_{h=1}^{k} \mathbf{1}_{\{X_h\}}(x) \nabla_{x_h} f_{ij}^{(n)} \left( \sum_{q=1}^{k} \ell_j(X_q) \right) \\
&= \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)\leq n\}} \sum_{h=1}^{N(D)} \mathbf{1}_{\{X_h\}}(x) \nabla_{x_h} f_{ij}^{(n)} \left( \sum_{q=1}^{N(D)} \ell_j(X_q) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{N}_f^D$,

$$\nabla_x f_{ij}^{(n)} \left( \sum_{x\in\mathbf{x}} \ell_j(x) \right) = (2^{-j}/\overline{\ell}_j)(\eta_n * \overline{f}_{ij})' \left( \sum_{x\in\mathbf{x}} \ell_j(x) \right) \exp\left( -\eta_n * \overline{f}_{ij} \left( \sum_{x\in\mathbf{x}} \ell_j(x) \right) / \overline{\ell}_j \right) \nabla \ell_j(x).$$

So, for any $n \geq 1$, $i$, $j$ and $k = 1, \ldots, N(D)$, we have

$$\|\nabla_{X_k}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} F_{ij}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}^D)\|^2 \leq d4^{-j}, \quad \text{a.s..} \tag{5.3}$$

For any $n, m \geq 1$, we deduce

$$\|\mathcal{H}^{1/2} F_{ij}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}^D) - \mathcal{H}^{1/2} F_{ij}^{(m)}(\mathbf{X}^D)\|^2_{\mathrm{L}^2_D} = \mathrm{E}[|\mathcal{H}^{1/2}(F_{ij}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}^D) - F_{ij}^{(m)}(\mathbf{X}^D))|^2]$$

$$= \mathrm{E}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \|\nabla^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}_{X_k}[F_{ij}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}^D) - F_{ij}^{(m)}(\mathbf{X}^D)]\|^2\right]$$

$$\leq d\, 4^{-j}\mathrm{E}\Bigg[\Bigg(\mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)\leq n\}}(\eta_n * \overline{f}_{ij})'\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \ell_j(X_k)\right)\exp\left(-\eta_n * \overline{f}_{ij}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \ell_j(X_k)\right)/\overline{\ell}_j\right) +$$

$$- \mathbf{1}_{\{N(D)\leq m\}}(\eta_m * \overline{f}_{ij})'\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \ell_j(X_k)\right)\exp\left(-\eta_m * \overline{f}_{ij}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \ell_j(X_k)\right)/\overline{\ell}_j\right)\Bigg)^2 N(D)\Bigg].$$

Due to the above remarks, applying Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem (recall that $N(D)$ has a finite mean since it has exponential tails) one has that this quantity goes to zero as $n, m$ go to infinity, and the claim follows. It remains to check (5.2). By Lemma 4.2 we have

$$\mathrm{E}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \|\nabla^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}_{X_k} F_{ij}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}^D)\|^2\right] = \mathrm{E}[(\mathcal{H}^{1/2} F_{ij}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}^D))^2].$$

Clearly

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{E}[(\mathcal{H}^{1/2} F_{ij}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}^D))^2] = \mathrm{E}[(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}\mathbf{F}_{ij})^2] = \overline{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{F}_{ij}, \mathbf{F}_{ij}),$$

and so we only need to check

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{E}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \|\nabla^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}_{X_k} F_{ij}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}^D)\|^2\right] = \mathrm{E}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \|\nabla^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}_{X_k} F_{ij}(\mathbf{X}^D)\|^2\right].$$

This easily follows by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem. Indeed, by (5.3), for any $i, j, n$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \|\nabla^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}_{X_k} F_{ij}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}^D)\|^2 \leq 4^{-j} d\, N(D), \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{5.4}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \|\nabla^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}_{X_k} F_{ij}^{(n)}(\mathbf{X}^D)\|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \|\nabla^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}_{X_k} F_{ij}(\mathbf{X}^D)\|^2, \quad \text{a.s.}.$$

*Proof of* (*iii*). It suffices to note that by (5.4) we have

$$\sup_{i,j} \sum_{k=1}^{N(D)} \|\nabla^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}_{X_k} F_{ij}(\mathbf{X}^D)\|^2 \leq \frac{d}{4} N(D), \quad \text{a.s.}.$$

Locality. Consider the bilinear form defined by

$$\Gamma(F(\mathbf{X}^D), G(\mathbf{X}^D)) := \sum_{i=1}^{N(D)} \nabla_{X_i}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} F(\mathbf{X}^D) \cdot \nabla_{X_i}^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}} G(\mathbf{X}^D), \quad F(\mathbf{X}^D), G(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D.$$

By the product rule of the gradient $\nabla_x^{\mathrm{N}_{lf}}$, we have, for any $F(\mathbf{X}^D), G(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_D$,

$$\Gamma(F(\mathbf{X}^D)G(\mathbf{X}^D), G(\mathbf{X}^D)) = G(\mathbf{X}^D)\Gamma(F(\mathbf{X}^D), G(\mathbf{X}^D)) + F(\mathbf{X}^D)\Gamma(G(\mathbf{X}^D), G(\mathbf{X}^D)).$$

Since the form $(\overline{\mathcal{E}}, \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}))$ is closed, by Remark *(ii)* page 287 in [9] we have that the form $\Gamma$ extends to $\mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}) \times \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}})$. We shall denote this extension by $\overline{\Gamma}$. So, for any $\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{G} \in \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}})$,

$$\overline{\Gamma}(\mathbf{F}\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{G}\overline{\Gamma}(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{G}) + \mathbf{F}\overline{\Gamma}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{G}). \tag{5.5}$$

Since the form $(\overline{\mathcal{E}}, \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}))$ is quasi-regular, by Proposition 1.7 page 151 in [14], for any $\mathbf{G} \in \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}))$, there exists $\mathbf{F}^* \in \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}})$ such that

$$0 \leq \mathbf{F}^* \leq \mathbf{1}_{\Omega \setminus \mathrm{supp}(|\mathbf{G}|P)}$$

and $\mathbf{F}^* > 0$ $P$-almost surely on $\Omega \setminus \mathrm{supp}(|\mathbf{G}|P)$. So $\mathbf{F}^*\mathbf{G} = 0$ for any $\omega \in \Omega$ and therefore by (5.5) we have

$$0 = \overline{\Gamma}(\mathbf{F}^*\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{G}\,\overline{\Gamma}(\mathbf{F}^*, \mathbf{G}) + \mathbf{F}^*\overline{\Gamma}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{G}).$$

Consequently,

$$\forall\ \mathbf{G} \in \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{\mathcal{H}^{1/2}}),\ \overline{\Gamma}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{G}) = 0 \text{ on } \Omega \setminus \mathrm{supp}(|\mathbf{G}|P).$$

The claim follows by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. □

# 6 Appendix

In this appendix we recall some results and properties on the closability of linear operators. Given $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$ and $(Y, \|\cdot\|_Y)$ two Banach spaces, and $A : \mathrm{Dom}(A) \longrightarrow Y$ a linear operator defined on a subspace $\mathrm{Dom}(A)$ of $X$, the domain of $A$, the operator $A$ is said to be closed if, for any sequence $(x_n)_{n\geq 1} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(A)$, such that $x_n$ converges to $x$ in $X$ and $Ax_n$ converges to $y$ in $Y$ we have $x \in \mathrm{Dom}(A)$ and $y = Ax$, i.e. $\mathrm{Dom}(A)$ is closed (or equivalently complete) *w.r.t.* the graph norm $\|\cdot\|_G := \|\cdot\|_X + \|A\cdot\|_Y$. A linear operator $A : \mathrm{Dom}(A) \longrightarrow Y$ is said closable if, for any sequence $(x_n)_{n\geq 1} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(A)$ such that $x_n$ converges to 0 in $X$ and

$Ax_n$ converges to $y$ in $Y$ it holds $y = 0$. In other words, $A$ is closable if, for any sequence $(x_n)_{n\geq 1} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(A)$ such that $x_n$ converges to 0 in $X$ and $(x_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is Cauchy *w.r.t.* the graph norm $\|\cdot\|_G$ it holds $Ax_n$ converges to 0 in $Y$. The minimal closed extension of the closable operator $A$ is the closed operator $\overline{A}$ whose domain $\mathrm{Dom}(\overline{A})$ is the completion of $\mathrm{Dom}(A)$ *w.r.t.* $\|\cdot\|_G$, i.e.

$$\mathrm{Dom}(\overline{A}) := \{x \in X : \exists\, (x_n)_{n\geq 1} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(A) : x_n \to x \text{ in } X \text{ and } (Ax_n)_{n\geq 1} \text{ converges in } Y\}$$

and we define

$$\overline{A}x := \lim_{n\to\infty} Ax_n, \qquad x \in \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{A}),$$

where the limit is in $Y$ and $(x_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is some sequence in $\mathrm{Dom}(A)$ such that $x_n$ converges to $x$ in $X$ and $(Ax_n)_{n\geq 1}$ converges in $Y$.

**Lemma 6.1** *For any compact subset $D$ of $S$, the space $\mathcal{S}_D$ is dense in $\mathrm{L}^2_D$.*

*Proof.* Let $V \in \mathrm{L}^2_D$ and assume that $\mathrm{E}[G(\mathbf{X}^D)V] = 0$ for all $G(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \mathcal{S}_D$. We need to show that $V = 0$ a.s.. Since $V$ is $\mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{X}^D}$-measurable we have that $V = u(N(D), X_1, \ldots, X_{N(D)})$, for some measurable function $u$. Therefore, for all integers $n \geq 1$ and $G(\mathbf{X}^D) \in \mathcal{S}_D$, with a little abuse of notation, we get

$$G(\emptyset)u(0,\emptyset)P(N(D) = 0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{E}[G(X_1,\ldots,X_n)u(n,X_1,\ldots,X_n) \,|\, N(D) = n] = 0. \tag{6.1}$$

Clearly, the first equality above yields $u(0,\emptyset) = 0$. We now prove that, for any $n \geq 1$, $u(n, x_1, \ldots, x_n) = 0$ a.s. *w.r.t.* the probability measure, say $\pi_D^{(n)}$, with density

$$j_D^{(n)}(x_1,\ldots,x_n)\mu(\mathrm{d}x_1)\ldots\mu(\mathrm{d}x_n)$$

(here, $j_D^{(n)}$ are the Janossy densities of $\mathbf{X}^D$, see the proof of Theorem 3.2).

Denote by $u_n^+$ and $u_n^-$ the positive and the negative part of $u(n,\cdot)$, respectively. Clearly (take $G \equiv 1$ in the second equality in (6.1)) we have

$$E_n := \mathrm{E}[u_n^+(X_1,\ldots,X_n) \,|\, N(D) = n] = \mathrm{E}[u_n^-(X_1,\ldots,X_n) \,|\, N(D) = n].$$

If $E_n = 0$ then $u_n^+ = u_n^- = 0$ $\pi_D^{(n)}$-a.s., hence $u_n = 0$ $\pi_D^{(n)}$-a.s.. If $E_n > 0$, then consider the probability measures on $D^n$:

$$\pi_D^{(n)\pm}(\mathrm{d}x_1 \ldots \mathrm{d}x_n) := \widehat{u}_n^{\pm}(x_1,\ldots,x_n)\,\pi_D^{(n)}(\mathrm{d}x_1,\ldots,\mathrm{d}x_n).$$

where

$$\widehat{u}_n^{\pm}(x_1,\dots,x_n) := \frac{1}{E_n} u_n^{\pm}(x_1,\dots,x_n).$$

Let R be a rectangular cell in $\mathbb{R}^{dn}$ and take $G(x_1,\dots,x_n) = \varphi_l(x_1,\dots,x_n)$ where $\varphi_l$ is a sequence in $\mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{dn})$ such that $\varphi_l(x_1,\dots,x_n)$ converges to $\mathbf{1}_{\{(x_1,\dots,x_n)\in \mathrm{R}\}}$ as $l$ goes to infinity, for all $x_1,\dots,x_n$. Combining the second equality in (6.1) with the dominated convergence theorem, we have $\pi_D^{(n)+}(\mathrm{R}\cap D^n) = \pi_D^{(n)-}(\mathrm{R}\cap D^n)$. Therefore, $\pi_D^{(n)+} \equiv \pi_D^{(n)-}$ on the Borel $\sigma$-field $\mathcal{B}(D^n)$. So $u_n^+(x_1,\dots,x_n) = u_n^-(x_1,\dots,u_n)$ $\pi_D^{(n)}$-a.s., and the claim follows. $\square$

# References

[1] S. Albeverio, Yu.G. Kondratiev and M. Röckner. Analysis and geometry on configuration spaces. *J. Func. Anal.* 154: 444–500, 1998.

[2] H. Brezis. *Analisi funzionale.* Liguori Editore, Napoli, 1986.

[3] I. Camilier and L. Decreusefond. Quasi-invariance and integration by parts for determinantal and permanental processes. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 259(1):268–300, 2010.

[4] D. J. Daley and D. Vere-Jones. *An introduction to the theory of point processes. Vol. I.* Probability and its Applications. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.

[5] D. J. Daley and D. Vere-Jones. *An introduction to the theory of point processes. Vol. II.* Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer, New York, second edition, 2008.

[6] N. Dunford and J. T. Schwartz. *Linear Operators*, volume II. Interscience publishers, New York, 1957.

[7] H.O. Georgii and H.J. Yoo. Conditional intensity and Gibbsianness of determinantal point processes. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 118(1-2):55–84, 2005.

[8] J. Hough, M. Krishnapur, Y. Peres, and B. Virág. *Zeros of Gaussian analytic functions and determinantal point processes*, volume 51 of *University Lecture Series.* American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2009.

[9] Z.M. Ma and M. Röckner. Construction of diffusions on configuration spaces. *Osaka J. Math.*, 37(2):273–314, 2000.

[10] O. Macchi. The coincidence approach to stochastic point processes. *Advances in Appl. Probability*, 7:83–122, 1975.

[11] J. Møller and R.P. Waagepetersen. *Statistical inference and simulation for spatial point processes*, volume 100 of *Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability.* Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2004.

[12] N. Privault and G.L. Torrisi. Density estimation of functionals of spatial point processes with application to wireless networks. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 43:1311–1344, 2011.

[13] N. Privault and G.L. Torrisi. Quasi invariance and integration by parts for Hermitian determinantal point processes: some extensions and new results. *Preprint*, 2012.

[14] M. Röckner and Z. M. Ma. *An Introduction to the Theory of (Non-symmetric) Dirichlet Forms.* Springer-Verlag, 1992.

[15] M. Röckner and B. Schmuland. Quasi-regular Dirichlet forms: examples and counterexamples. *Canad. J. Math.*, 47(1):165–200, 1995.

[16] T. Shirai and Y. Takahashi. Random point fields associated with certain Fredholm determinants. I. Fermion, Poisson and boson point processes. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 205(2):414–463, 2003.

[17] B. Simon. *Trace ideals and their applications*, volume 120 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second edition, 2005.

[18] A. Soshnikov. Determinantal random point fields. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 55(5(335)):107–160, 2000.

[19] H. Tamura and K. R. Ito. A canonical ensemble approach to the fermion/boson random point processes and its applications. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 263(2):353–380, 2006.

[20] M.N.M. van Lieshout. *Markov point processes and their applications*. Imperial College Press, London, 2000.

[21] H. J. Yoo. Dirichlet forms and diffusion processes for fermion random point fields. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 219(1):143–160, 2005.

[22] M.W. Yoshida. Construction of infinite-dimensional interacting diffusion processes through Dirichlet forms. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 106(2):265–297, 1996.